LSTA Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Comfort Suites, April 9-10, 2008

Tuesday, April 11: Noon – 4:00 pm
(New member orientation 10:00 – 11:45 a.m.; public hearing 1:00 p.m.)

Present: Jan Adams, Roxane Bartelt, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe, Phyllis Davis, Terry Dawson, Becki George, Jim Gingery, Joan Johnson, Mildred McDowell, Jane Pearlmutter, Michael Sheehan, Deborah Kabler, and Zora Sampson, Tasha Saecker.

Absent: Bea Lebal

Division Staff: Terrie Howe, Rick Grobschmidt, Mike Cross, Kate Bugher, Al Zimmerman, Sally Drew, Bob Bocher, Barb Huntington, Donna Steffan, John DeBacher, Martha Berninger

Welcome, Opening Remarks, Introductions
The meeting was called to order at 12:55 p.m. by Terrie Howe. Terrie asked the group to introduce themselves for the benefit of new members.

Public Hearing
Howe asked for input for the hearing. Being none, the public hearing concluded at 1:03 p.m.

Review Agenda
Howe reviewed the agenda and invited input for changes. There were none. Cross noted that times are not indicated, but we will try to carry on in a similar fashion to previous years.

Review Minutes of November 14-15, 2007 meeting
Bartelt noted that her name is spelled incorrectly on page 9. Gilderson-Duwe noted DeBacher's eloquent testimony on page 6.

DLTCL Administrator's Remarks
Grobschmidt welcomed new members as well as new coordinator Howe and noted that continued flat funding of LSTA adds continued challenges. The Superintendent welcomes and values the input from the committee. He expressed gratitude for the service of all the committee members.

LSTA Coordinator's Report
Howe reviewed materials in the packet including the reimbursement form. Grobschmidt noted the behind-the-scenes service provided by George Winston Hall.

Howe also noted the five year plan and Cross discussed the process that had gone into its development and use. Howe reported that when she started at DPI, she reviewed all the reports of the 2006 projects and she displayed the sizeable annual report that must be submitted to IMLS. She warned that IMLS has recently been conducting greater scrutiny of compliance by individual states.

Procedures for Discussion of LSTA Grant Categories and Conflict of Interest Policy
Cross discussed the process for discussion and the fact that motions on the actual categories and amounts will not occur until tomorrow. Regarding the conflict of interest policy, he pointed out the relevant language that may preclude discussion, motions, or votes on certain categories as appropriate. He noted that uncertainties can be discussed with him or Howe for clarification.

He noted that while there has been no in-person testimony, he did receive an emailed proposal from former committee member Terrence Burton for a Health Information Awareness and Access category.

Sampson noted that this proposed project somewhat duplicates the services of the "AHEC" grants, one of which is in operation in Northwoods. She talked about her participation when she arrived at Rice Lake, and that they do a wonderful job. Howe pointed out that the Nicolet Library System in Green Bay had been involved with a NAHEC grant which she believes was funded through the Department of Education. Sampson said it might be useful to have some funds available for entities to join a consortium.

LSTA 2009 Budget Overview

Cross reviewed the spreadsheet showing the budget history for LSTA categories and appropriations. While there had been a history of small increases, the last two cycles have limited funding. We had anticipated an increase in 2008 funding, but it was not forthcoming, and there was actually a 1.5% decrease, or about $75,000 for Wisconsin. The Division adjusted some of the awards to accommodate the shortage and noted those on the spreadsheet. The Merging Shared Systems category was reduced with the intention to continue it in a subsequent year. The other was elimination of the additional funds for Statewide Delivery. Davis noted that SCLS is not the beneficiary of those grants but coordinates the statewide service. The grant helps offset some costs for inter-system delivery. Cross noted that the adjustment was passed on in increased delivery fees to the other systems.

For 2009, Cross discussed anticipated funds and carryover expectations. DPI has two years to expend each year's allocation, so carryover is not a problem. Another impact has been in the LSTA administrative costs imposed by DPI, where more indirect funding was charged to the Division. Grobschmidt noted that the Governor has called a special session to address the state budget shortfall for the next biennium.

Cross discussed the detailed budget for the Division's internal projects and the existing costs. He invited questions but there were none.

Consideration of Preliminary Grant Categories for 2009

Public Library Development Statewide Technology
Cross reported that the category is to support the library technology consultant position (Bocher) as well as planning activities, as well as assisting libraries with the TEACH program and the federal e-rate program.

Reference and Loan Statewide Library Resource Sharing
Drew commented that there are a number of ways that R&LL uses federal funds. She referred to the information included in the packet, and changes in DPI funding that affected her department, as well as how vacancies have affected the budget.

Other than that, it is a status quo budget. While the vendor costs for BadgerLink come out of the Universal Service Funds, the costs of the coordinator's position do not. Also included in this item is BadgerLink authentication, statistics, and changes in database offerings from the vendors. They have also been incorporating more cross-linking between products as well as changes such as work to have citations appear in Google Scholar. They prepared a toolkit to be used in training and awareness of BadgerLink. The category also covers a half-time position for the statewide government document depository programming, using OCLC's digital management services.

Johnson asked how much of the 50% federal funding is LSTA. Drew answered that it is all LSTA funding. Drew said she does get some funding from other agencies for services and processing. She noted that the cataloging processing has decreased in recent years. Davis had questions about the background information. She asked about the reimbursements. Drew noted that was for WISCAT. Davis asked about the number of ILL requests that have decreased and the noted reduction in backlog of requests. How much and how big is the backlog, and when does it go away? Drew responded that, when working with Fretwell-Downing, there was considerable backlog in searching Minitex and local circulation systems. She said it is down to a week or less. Davis said it had been that last year; Drew said she would like to get it down to a day. Davis asked about the approximately 74,000 requests that are manually made out-of-state. Drew reported that is for OCLC and that currently there is no automatic way to transfer those from WISCAT to OCLC. Davis asked how much circulation is from the R&LL collection. Drew said it is fairly stable and between 9 and 11 thousand per year. Berninger said the backlog issue is for a variety of reasons, sometimes including the reference process.

Johnson asked if the budget reported is total cost to continue; Drew said it is for projected salary and benefits.

State Resource Sharing Access / WISCAT
Drew reviewed the category and costs involved and referred to the narrative distributed. There have been no changes in staffing or scope of work. Davis asked again about the projected revenues for reimbursement payments and whether that correlates with license purchases. Drew reported that the WISCAT fee revenue has been forthcoming and is anticipated for 2009.

School Participation in Shared Integrated Library Systems
Steffan reviewed the current project in place that includes five, not seven participants. The system has just started in operation with all technology in place, and training to be conducted. But since a quarter of the school year has been lost, and the schools will be closed in the summer, sufficient data will not be forthcoming this school year. Two other school districts have come forward as desiring to be included and she feels that they should be included and the scope expanded to see how it will be affected by a larger group. Consequently, they would like to continue and expand the shared school library project.

Sampson asked if the schools can be added to the shared integrated library system in the summer. Steffan responded that they cannot be added until funds are available in January. She said that at least some of the spring and fall 2008 activity will be available from the current project. Gilderson-Duwe asked how the group is addressing the delivery issues among them. Steffan said CESA 10 has a delivery system, but there will need to be ties to the public library delivery system. Gilderson-Duwe noted he was more interested in the school-to-school resource sharing. Steffan said the school must add their holdings to WISCAT, and that they may join the statewide delivery system. Drew asked for confirmation that the goal was to increase resource sharing, not only within but outside the districts.

Davis said that last year the committee had added funds for an evaluation. Steffan said that an evaluator has been selected and that data collection is in progress. Grobschmidt asked when it would be completed. Steffan said there would be a mid-point then a final report in November. Pearlmutter asked if the evaluator thought there would be enough data available. Steffan said that is why she would like to have two more districts added and for the project to continue next year. Adams asked whether an evaluation piece would be included in the next project. Steffan said she hoped that the goal would be to have the evaluation continue but they cannot contract with him until the project is approved. George wondered if the initial collection of data will provide data to show if additional schools confirm that adding schools will create growth in resource sharing. Gilderson-Duwe asked if the expansion schools are already in CESA 10 and Steffan confirmed that. Sheehan asked if they were previously automated and she confirmed that they are.

Virtual Reference
Drew distributed a new narrative report to replace that which had been distributed. She reported on the development and growth of the service and of the issue of continued funding. Sampson said that her system used to participate but that, as an individual library they simply cannot afford it, but she hopes the service can continue.

Delivery Services Projects
Drew reviewed that it is a subsidy for the backbone delivery system and for extending it from the northern point in Wausau to the NWLS through a private vendor. Dawson asked if there is any idea of increased fuel cost impact. She said they have not reviewed projected 2009 costs, but that the delivery committee will consider them in their meeting in several weeks.

Public Library System Technology Projects
Bocher summarized the category with examples of how the current funding is being used. He talked about funding for online databases and how the language has expanded to obtain more information on the databases and content leased to ensure there is no overlap with BadgerLink.

Grobschmidt added that the information is useful when the legislature is approached for BadgerLink funding to show the economy of scale without duplication of services. The information is also useful to the Division for resources to consider adding to BadgerLink.

Adams asked whether Virtual Reference could have the same impact as databases versus BadgerLink resources, or whether other virtual reference might duplicate what is being done separately. Drew said she is not aware of a competing service that might duplicate 24/7, except for local instant messaging services or a homework service that is prohibitively expensive.

Johnson asked if something had to be foregone to reduce the category to $350,000 from $400,000. Bocher replied that the proposal for the overall category has been reduced to help address the budget limitations.

Merging Shared Integrated Library Systems
This would be the second year for this category. This was adjusted to accommodate the reduction to IFLS and bring the Barron-Rusk County shared system into IFLS. Next year the Brown County system, with Green Bay and surrounding communities, would also be added to the OWLS/Nicolet shared system. Dawson noted that it is uncertain whether Brown County would join and asked if the funds would be re-allocated if the grant is not requested. Bocher has confirmed that is the case.

Digitization—Local Resources
Drew reviewed the category. She reported that WiLS had requested that the category be expanded to also include the WHO project with the State Historical Society. Drew said they are not parallel projects so it might be better to establish as a separate category. The UW projects and metatagging is all conducted within the projects, but the WHO projects are broken out separately and there are more challenges. She did note, however, that a formal proposal had been requested. Gingery said he is glad that the decision had been made and he supports it. He wonders if those could be included within innovative uses of technology and Drew reported that system technology project funds have been used in the past.

Drew also reminded the committee that Larry Nix had requested digitization of the Wisconsin Library Bulletin. She said she has explored cost estimates that could be considerably less expensive at $8000. Drew has put in a request on behalf of DPI to have the materials digitized as part of their own projects and awaits response. Pearlmutter said it could be considered as a departmental project and unbound for that purpose then rebound. Thereby the project could be conducted without LSTA funds. If it were, the

category would have to be changed or expanded. Adams asked why the fund amount had been limited, and limited the number of times a library had applied. Drew said the committee had decided to expand it to offer the service to more libraries that had not conducted a project before. Howe mentioned the challenge of the grant minimum and Drew explained why UW had requested the threshold. Gilderson-Duwe confirmed that a system could aggregate some smaller projects and Drew confirmed that has been the case; also that local libraries could work with local historical societies. Howe asked if some of the problem with local museums or historical societies is that they charge for access. Drew said the collaboration has helped. Kabler asked if staffing could be included in the application. Drew and Howe explained why it is not included in an application.

Innovative Use of Technology
Bocher distributed a replacement narrative, since the one originally included had some text from the wireless category inadvertently included. He mentioned that the committee had requested a broad, vague, wide open category, and that is what they got. Many proposed projects included games for educational use, some others had pod casting and other new services. He noted the problem of trying to be more restrictive in the language for the category since that might inhibit innovation. He said that the reviewers had been told to look for interesting aspects of the grant application in assessing them. Cross discussed some of the issues involved in addressing IMLS requirements and limits for entertainment purposes. Sampson suggested having some of that wording in the category description. Adams wondered if it would appear in the annual handbook. Cross said it would and that the applicants had to provide assurances that the funds would not be used for entertainment. Dawson said that, despite the caveats, he is glad to have the new category and that libraries have welcomed it as evidenced by the number of applications.

Wireless Internet Access
Bocher reported that about 80 libraries had taken advantage of this category and that the state has greatly increased the number of libraries that offer the service, bringing it closer to the national average. With continuation, the percentage can increase to above 80%. DLTCL has proposed that 2009 be the last year for the category. He explained too that the impediment of limited bandwidth has been somewhat improved with the recent increases in TEACH bandwidth to libraries.

Special Needs

Accessibility Category
Huntington reviewed this new category. She said that many libraries have addressed accessibility issues, but that some areas of the state and individual libraries do still have challenges to address. The category is requested at $75,000, which has been split out from the broader category. She discussed the issue of accessible access doors with power adapters through retrofitting with a power opener. She discussed the issues with IMLS which had concerns about construction, but the misunderstanding is being addressed. She said that the funds available for door retrofits may or may not be included depending on the response from IMLS. Davis has asked if this would be a one-time category. Huntington said we would have to see what response and interest would be and continuation would be considered as appropriate.

Sensory Mobility
This category has been reduced to $60,000. There were no questions.

Adult Family and Early Literacy
Huntington reviewed the HOLA project and how ESL would be included or addressed. Adolescent Literacy will be addressed with a new initiative to be kicked off in May. The links to the overall goals of LSTA are established so we will now invite grants for teen literacy projects within this category.

Also, there is a state and national initiative to emphasize math and science concepts for early learning, so language will be added to encourage projects to address them. Grobschmidt mentioned the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) focus through DPI and hopes this will dovetail with that project. Huntington invited committee members to the adolescent literacy conference on May 15. She also promoted the Arbuthnot lecture on April 17, with a math/science program on the 16th. Sampson asked about special needs, particularly autism, which made her wonder what public libraries could do and how we might address that. Huntington mentioned two publications by DPI that specifically address special needs, most recently the youth with special needs. Adams asked if sensory or literacy could be used to address autism and wondered if the guidelines could more specifically address in the language. Davis mentioned an autism grant that Bartelt had developed for Kenosha that is being implemented now.

Davis said she would nag DLTCL to make sure that summaries of current projects be prepared, posted and distributed for those developing new grants. Howe said she is appropriately nagged.

Library Improvement
Cross summarized the activities that are conducted in this category. He said the only change from prior years have been changes in salaries, benefits, and indirect costs. Davis asked what we have used for our projection for increases in benefits. Zimmerman said it is from past history. Davis simply had wondered if we had advance information.

Communications and Planning
Grobschmidt reported that this is at the same level it has been for several years, for meetings, publications, and travel, including LITAC meetings, the meetings of COLAND, participation in national associations, and as well as the printing and mailing of Channel.

LSTA Administration
The change has been that 10% of the LSTA coordinator's position since Branson had been .9 FTE and the position has been expanded. And easily 10% of Terrie's position is spent on LSTA administration. Also the DPI indirect charge went up in 2007.

Library Development Training Projects
Cross noted that the Training category had not been recommended for 2009 and asked DeBacher to summarize what is being done. DeBacher reported that, if the category is to be continued in future years, he would like to see more focus in the qualifying projects, addressing planning and staff development.

The committee adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Terrie Howe reconvened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. April 10, 2008

LSTA Administration
Howe noted that, while not on the agenda, this item is in the handout on page 31. It pays for advisory committee expenses, training of reviewers, and DPI indirect charge $70,000, which the Division has no control over.

Additional Grant Categories for Consideration (from committee and public hearings)

None were proposed from the floor. Pearlmutter said she had some questions regarding the Health Information category proposed by Terry Burton and said she would like some more information about the area health resource projects. However, she is not sure whether LSTA funds are appropriate for some of the online resources, unless they use the library as the point of access. Sampson said there is training

going on in her area. Gingery said that the category has value as an opportunity for collaboration for health awareness. Also he likes that the category was proposed by an outgoing committee member and feels that the committee should also generate ideas for funding categories. Pearlmutter said that, while creating new materials is not efficient, creating new linkages to community and professional resources is valuable. Drew said that the federal government has emphasized consumer health information and access for health professionals. While there is much information available, it has not yet changed behavior. More proactive marketing and resource awareness may be needed; whether that is a role for libraries should be determined. "Health Literacy" may be the important concept for the committee to consider.

Adams said there is also a need for financial literacy. Perhaps the category could be broader and also encompass other consumer literacy. Davis said she had attended a session at the local literacy network where there was discussion on access to medical information for people with reading issues and people learning English. Huntington said there are two levels of literacy awareness—survival skills (e.g. how to read a medicine bottle) versus full health awareness (e.g. how else could disease be treated). Davis asked if the medical literacy would apply under the literacy category. Huntington said that the low-level awareness could be accommodated, but probably not the higher level resources.

Sampson asked if additional funding should be added to the literacy category, or a separate category.

Recommendations on Grant Categories and Budget for 2008

Zimmerman reviewed the spreadsheet and how the totals accumulate, as well as the total available funds.

Howe invited motions for grant categories and budgets.

Adams moved to fund WISCAT at the staff recommended amount, seconded by Johnson. No discussion. The motion carried unanimously with Davis abstaining.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to fund DLTCL Library Development at the staff recommended amount, seconded by Davis. The motion carried unanimously.

Adams moved to fund the Delivery Project at $90,000. Gingery seconded. The motion carried unanimously with Sheehan and Davis abstaining.

Sampson moved that Virtual Reference be approved at the recommended level, with Gilderson-Duwe seconding. The motion carried unanimously.

Gilderson-Duwe moved that Wireless connection be approved at $20,000, seconded by Sampson. Gilderson-Duwe said he is recommending a lesser amount based on the report that we have made much progress, so a lesser amount may be enough to cover limited additional growth. This motion received unanimous approval.

Adams moved to approve the Digitization of Local Resources at $30,000, seconded by Bartelt. Pearlmutter asked what the total requests were last year. Drew said that all projects were funded at $33,890. Gingery noted that a library that had not been interested before is now interested. He believes there are still many resources with potential for more collaboration. Drew noted that R&LL have been making more visits to systems with Digitization discussed, which may generate more interest.

Adams asked why staffing is not included—perhaps to make the library buy into the project? The restriction might limit smaller libraries. Howe reported that the UW does most of the project, so not much staffing is required. The library provides a good project, explanation of pictures and turns them over. The

staff does not need to learn much about digitizing. Kabler noted that her library had been involved last year and it was not difficult. The UW staff was very helpful and the final project is amazing. Dawson noted that, while it is a great thing, it is only one model of digitization and we are pinched in many places. By limiting here, it may allow more funding elsewhere. He supports the limit in funding. The motion carried 9 in favor, 5 opposed. The motion carried.

Gilderson-Duwe asked how the amount of $27,500 was arrived at for the shared automation category for schools. Steffan that it had been the unallocated amount from the staff budget meeting and that, by November, a more accurate amount would be available. Bugher said that some costs are known, so the amount is not simply arbitrary. The most arbitrary amount would be the continuing cost of the evaluator. Gilderson-Duwe moved to fund that category at the recommended amount. Sheehan seconded. There was no discussion. The motion carried, 13 in favor, Adams abstaining.

Davis moved $670,000 for DLTCL Reference and told an anecdote reflecting on how the budget is tight and some reduction must be made over all categories. Dawson seconded, asking about the 44,000 ILL requests and wondered how much of a decrease that amounted to. Drew said that the number is a "work in progress," and that they are looking at a more efficient staffing model. Now that they can identify holdings, they had to do that manually, which added to the backlog. Now that more has been automated, they are now at a better position to address all requests as they come up, so the staffing is still required. Davis said she was not thinking so much of the staff but wondered more whether the funds spent on the collection. Drew said that only state funds are spent on the collection—LSTA funds are primarily for staff. Davis said that, politically, it is going to get to be more untenable for the Division to retain so much of the available funds and some reasonable reductions should be made. She wanted to bring it up for discussion. Drew said that the amounts that were taken out are very similar to the amount of the technology project's category. She wonders if the technology projects have become somewhat of an extension of the state aid. Acknowledging that the systems have had limited funding, there is recognition that the system technology category funds have often gone toward recurring operations.

Gingery said he looked over the technology projects from last year and said that it cannot be generalized to all systems that the funds are all operational. He said that, without the funds, there would not be many innovative new elements of service, such as e-commerce, that they would be unable to accomplish.

Sampson asked what the non-staff component of this category would be. Drew said it pays for databases that are not covered by state funding and also indirect costs for all R&LL services. Sampson wondered if there are some that could be discontinued. Gilderson-Duwe noted that they have cut staff three years consecutively at Oshkosh and, while it is not fun, is sometimes nonetheless necessary, and asked what she would cut. Drew said that she would not even hazard a guess. Adams asked if the bid for BadgerLink could afford some savings. Drew reported that it would not affect staffing. Davis said she did not intend to create close scrutiny of the R&LL budget, but that the committee should look at possible cuts since state costs keep going up. Dawson said that a difficult balance is trying to be achieved, and that he has faced drastic staff cuts in the face of stagnant or reduced funding. When he sees big cuts in certain categories, then the state level should be considered, as well. He noted that WISCAT and this category are the two biggest chunks in the whole LSTA budget.

Grobschmidt noted the three basic sources of DLTCL funding—General Purpose, segregated (USF), and Federal funds (primarily LSTA). He noted that there have been cuts over the past few years in GPR funding which has caused a shift in funding levels. He knows that there will be further cuts likely in the next budget process. He noted also that federal funding has not been favorable for overall DPI operations.

Gingery said the he feels there has been a structural problem in funding and that perhaps more creative thinking is required. There has not been enough of a move toward a statewide vision. As long as we are

caught in the box and are caught in this position, the committee may need to consider it, since LSTA funding is simply too easily available to offset state funding. We must realize the structural situation we are in but that must be considered on a larger forum. He would support the requested funding, hoping that such consideration would be made. Johnson said, too, that she could not support such drastic cuts. Kabler said that, from the very-small library perspective, she would be concerned that such a drastic cut would have a negative effect on her library.

Drew said she acknowledges the collision course we are on and she is not surprised at the discussion. The other hard problem to swallow is evidenced at how changes have been made at other states where most LSTA funds have been retained at the state level. Davis confirmed that her proposal was to bring attention to the situation and the problem. She proposed the cut to help bring the issue up to the visioning summit to ensure that attention is brought. Pearlmutter noted that, while it would be a message, it will not help the state problem that is fundamental. The direction is hard but she agrees with Gingery. In Wisconsin we have so many small libraries that simply do not have the resources to write and carry out small grants. While larger units of service are necessary, it cannot be attained in the committee and such a statement out of the R&LL budget would not have the desired effect. Davis said there is nonetheless a certain amount of pain and it should be shared. Gilderson-Duwe called the question. The motion failed 1 to 13.

Dawson moved to fund R&LL at $710,400, seconded by Saecker. Pearlmutter said that many of us have a flat budget and look to other places to shift the costs. Dawson feels that this is a much more reasonable cut that might be manageable. The motion carried unanimously (Gilderson-Duwe absent).

The group took a short break at 9:47.

The meeting resumed at 10:00 and Howe reminded the committee to consult the green summary sheet to see all categories not displayed on the projection screen.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to establish a category for Health Information Awareness and Access at $20,000, seconded by Pearlmutter. Huntington warned that it could not appropriately be put under literacy. Pearlmutter wondered about "special needs." Cross said we would find the appropriate broad category later. Davis asked for clarification on the Burton proposal and what would be accomplished. Pearlmutter said that she would like to see a category but that it does not necessarily have to be as all-inclusive as what was proposed. She would like to focus on partnerships. Bartelt asked what the grant limits might be. Sampson asked Pearlmutter if there is a dollar limit in mind. Pearlmutter said she would not like to see a dollar limit, since it might be for one. Howe asked if it would be non-competitive. The committee did not think so. The motion carried unanimously.

Davis moved to fund the literacy category at $225,000, seconded by Sheehan. There was no discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

Dawson moved, seconded by Bartelt to allocate $50,000 for Sensory Mobility Disabilities. The motion carried unanimously.

Pearlmutter moved to allocate $50,000 in the Accessibility Mobility category. While she would not normally recommend a cut in such a category, and that work is needed, there is duplication on what is allowed. The motion was seconded by Dawson who agreed with her comments. The motion carried unanimously.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to fund the Merging Shared System at the recommended amount of $115,000, seconded by Saecker. Pearlmutter agreed that she hopes that the full amount will not be needed. Dawson

said the discussions between OWLS and Nicolet are ongoing but preliminary. Bocher said that, with a change in director and some change in the board at BCPL, the atmosphere is more positive. The motion carried unanimously.

Johnson moved to fund the Innovative Technology category at $50,000, based on the number of requests this year, though it would still be $10,000 less than the funding amount for 2008. The motion was seconded by Sheehan. Kabler asked whether this could also be used for digitization. Howe said yes. The motion carried unanimously.

Dawson moved to fund DLTCL Library Development and Communication and Planning as well as LSTA Administration at the recommended amounts. Gilderson-Duwe seconded. Johnson asked what categories were still open. Gingery said only Library System Technology Projects. The motion carried unanimously.

Gingery moved $350,000 for Library System Technology Projects. Pearlmutter seconded the motion. Davis asked if this is that last category to be funded. Davis asked if system directors could discuss the category. She asked why not simply allocate the remaining funds. Gingery thought that some discussion might be useful. He is not uncomfortable with the reduction and thought that more open discussion of the additional allocation would be useful. Davis said that, for the most part, the category assists the member libraries with new services, not simply additional bandwidth or other ongoing projects. Consequently, she likes to have the larger amount for the category. Adams said that, after this discussion, she would like to have the additional funds go toward digitization. The motion carried unanimously.

Howe noted that $7,300 is still on the table. Dawson suggested that the Library Development Planning category may still be worthy of consideration, and that training is still necessary. The amount is not much but it might allow five or six projects. Davis seconded the motion. Cross wondered if the amounts should be changed. Dawson suggested a $1500 maximum, and a minimum of $300. The motion carried 13 to 1.

Dawson asked about changing the criteria for the digitization amount and wondered if the threshold were lowered to $2000 if that would create problems for the UW coordination. Pearlmutter said that the UW hoped to limit the number of training and orientation sessions they would need to conduct. Drew said she would be willing to discuss a lower amount with the UW, since it would not yield a greater number of projects. Sampson asked the number this year. Howe responded there were six projects. Dawson said he would like staff to have that discussion and make adjustments if allowable.

Davis asked how the amount for the Merging Shared System was developed. Bocher reported the relationship to the previous shared system calculations. Dawson asked if the Division feels that there is some philosophical pre-commitment to the $40,000 to the IFLS project. Cross said that the full amount may not be required; it would be based on the number of joining libraries. Adams asked if the category would sunset and Bocher responded that this would be the last year. Sampson asked, if there is money remaining, could they be carried over. Cross replied that reallocation could take place at the November meeting.

Howe asked if the Health category is intended to be competitive and whether she needs to go back to the proposer. Cross said that staff could develop it based on committee suggestions. Drew said she also asked for direction. She wonders what the statewide health access database would be and whether it should be included. Pearlmutter said the database should not be considered. Drew also asked about the eligibility for the applicants—what "other organizations" would be. Pearlmutter said that faculty might create a partnership with other agencies. Dawson said he is wrestling with the category and is sympathetic with the notion but it is pretty hazy, whereas there are many articulated needs that are not getting funded. He wonders if it may be better to forego this category now, develop it further, and bring it back when funds may be more available. Sampson said she would prefer partnering with libraries or library systems.

Pearlmutter said the implication is there. Davis agreed with the point raised by Dawson and said she is not sure who would be the beneficiaries and whether enough would become available to the public. Davis agreed that the statewide database could be eliminated. Pearlmutter asked how it will get developed, but she would like to see what kinds of proposals come in. Sampson asked for clarification of competitive and non-competitive. Pearlmutter said the applicant pool could be opened up but that collaboration would be required. DeBacher had concern that it would invite county health departments to fund ongoing operations and would like to see applicants as only libraries. Pearlmutter said that would be fine along with evidence of Davis moved to limit the applicant to be public libraries, public library systems and other types of libraries, and eliminate the first grant purpose in the proposal. Dawson seconded the motion and said that he agrees that the category as written could open up to projects very unrelated to what seems to be intended. Sampson said she hopes that the public would be the eventual beneficiary. The motion carried unanimously.

Review of LSTA Process for 2009

Cross expressed his appreciation and said that the recommendations would be seriously considered by the Superintendent's office.

LSTA Timetable, Review Process, Application Form, Rating Criteria
He pointed out the timeline included in the 2008 manual. Information would be distributed in May and information sessions would be held in June. Applications would be due in early September.

Cross pointed out the rating form used for 2008 grants, as well as the application form. He is open to suggestions on the application process, form, rating process, although some is required by IMLS, and some additional ones have been added. Sampson said she agrees with Davis that project abstracts and application information should be made available for review by committee members as soon as possible. Howe noted that IMLS has indicated that information on grants from other states may soon be available.

Davis asked about the new certifications and whether the lobbying and drug-free workface had been IMLS requirements, which Cross confirmed. Davis also asked about the cover letter that had been sent to recipients requiring more information about acknowledgement of the funding.

Gingery made the suggestion to make it clearer when the grant applications can be found and that the date should be included in the timetable. DeBacher said that there have been discussions in the past on the possibility of mini-grants or simplified forms and, while "mini-grants" is not a term favored by IMLS, the forms could be streamlined, clarified, or simplified if the committee has suggestions how to do so. Huntington clarified how some grants may be centrally administered by systems and executed on behalf of member libraries without some of the need for individual recipient reports. Pearlmutter mentioned some of the more ludicrous requirements for federal grant programs.

Final Comments

Howe said the changes would be made and submitted. She said that the next meeting would likely be during the week of November 10th, 2008.

Cross said that lunch would be provided but may not be moved up to 11:30 as we had requested. He hopes the committee members would stay and enjoy lunch.

Grobschmidt again thanked the committee and said that it is one of the most productive and efficient committee meetings we have had. He very much appreciates the work and time committed to the process. The unknown component will be the LSTA funding available for 2009. He does not know when the

federal budget will be discussed or passed. He also thanked the staff for the time and work in preparing for the meeting and thanked Terrie Howe and looks forward to many more meetings. The Department of Public Instruction is in the process of formulating the next budget. He asked who will attend the visioning summit (several hands were raised). Johnson asked if the LSTA appropriation is much less than we expect, if the committee is asked for input on reductions. Grobschmidt replied that, if the cuts are known by November, then the committee will make formal recommendations. But if after, the Division may only be able to request some input via email to make appropriate adjustment recommendations to the Superintendent.

Dawson noted that the federal legislative day will be in a couple of weeks and that Grobschmidt will attend. He asked if it is an appropriate time for committee members to contact their legislators. Grobschmidt said that it is and that he also would take information on how the LSTA grants have affected various congressional districts. Pearlmutter noted that legislators take particular notice of such information. Davis said she has provided trustees who have attended with even more specific information about specific grants and information pieces. Grobschmidt suggested informing legislators about kickoff events for projects.

The meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

Recorded by John DeBacher